

1. **Conduct an analysis of data. Identify and describe the factors that prevented the local educational agency (LEA) from achieving the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** (Five page maximum for this item).

A. **Analysis of data and problems found**

The California Education Authority (CEA) currently consists of six schools and two conservation camps located in four counties throughout the state. Each school in the district spans a range of demographic characteristics, with total student enrollment from 70 students to 287 students; number of English learners from 11 to 65, and English learner percentage of the of the total student population from 13% to 25.5%. The districts overall English learner percentage is 20.47% (based on OBITS Monthly Population Report dated November 30, 2009 and the English Learner Monthly Report dated October 31, 2009). English learner enrollment has decreased from 1106 in 2003 to 454 in 2009. The decrease in English learner population is a result of students returning to the county of original commitment. In 2009, two DJJ facilities were closed (Dewitt Nelson High School and Marie C. Romero). One additional facility is slated to close January 2010. Students will be disbursed to the remaining six schools.

The Education Services Branch (ESB) located in Sacramento County, completed the English Learner Self Survey Assessment (ELSSA) via teleconference. Survey participants included the district English learner specialist and an English learner coordinator from a northern and southern school. Stakeholders discussed each item and agreed upon mutual ratings to best describe the districts overall rating. Information technology support staff assisted in the evaluation process by extracting critical information from the districts student database.

Statistical information used to develop the districts Improvement Plan Addendum (IPA) includes; Ward Information Network (WIN), CELDT Reports-McGraw Hill, DataQuest-California Department of Education, OBITS-DJJ and the English Learner Monthly Report-DJJ. Year to year comparative assessment information for individual English learners was difficult to extract from the WIN network due to duplication of records during a recent upgrade. Information technology improvements are in progress to accomplish more accurate data reporting in the future.

AMAO1 in year 2007-08, the districts percent of students making annual progress in learning English was 56.3%, above the state target of 50.1% (**MET**). AMAO1 in 2008-09, the districts percent of students making annual progress in learning English was *% (less than 65% of the 2008 test takers have previous year scores – no values printed). Manual calculations placed the district at the 50% and did not meet the 51.6% target (**NOT MET**).

AMAO2 in year 2007-08, the percentage of students attaining English proficiency on CELDT was 27%, slightly below the state target of 28.9% (**NOT MET**). AMAO2 in year 2008-09, the percent of students attaining English proficiency on CELDT was *% (less than 65% of the 2008 test takers have prior year scores- no values printed), below the state target of 30.6% (**NOT MET**).

AMAO3, Adequate yearly progress for the English learner subgroup is tracked using ASAM criteria. CEA does not use CST scores as a student performance indicator; therefore, performance levels are not aligned with Far Below Basic to Advanced level criteria used for Title III performance indicators. For purposes of the IPA, this objective is not applicable.

CAHSEE and CASAS assessment tools are used to evaluate annual progress in ELA and Math. All reclassified English learners (RFEP) pass CAHSEE ELA and Math with a score of 350 or greater. This is district criteria for reclassification consideration. CASAS testing is a low priority test for reclassified students and score do not reflect the student's actual ability.

Approximately 52% of Early Advanced and Advanced English learners pass the CAHSEE ELA and Math with a score of greater than 350. The other 48% of Intermediate, Early Intermediate and Beginning level English learners receive remediation to improve test scores in both ELA and Math.

Data collection demonstrates that CEA students remain at the High Point C level significantly longer (three to four semester average) than levels A, B and Beginning (two semester average). This is primarily due to student test scores on the district ELA/ELD placement test. Policy requires a student to score 85-90% to become a "Strategic Learner" enrolled in mainstreamed English with additional support. Students with a 91-100% placement score or CAHSEE score of >350 are placed with "Benchmark Level learners".

An emphasis has been placed on CAHSEE and CELDT scores at the secondary level. Stakeholders will discuss the addition of CASAS scores for future placement of English learner students.

B. Strengths and weaknesses of current plan for English learners

Strengths:

1. The "current plan for English learners" is a district strength. The newly revised English Learner Policy Manual (10/30/09) was agreed upon by the Office of Civil Rights and the Division of Juvenile Justice in fulfillment of the Voluntary Resolution Plan (VRP) in settlement of a court order. All schools and camps follow the same policy for English learners as defined sections 4400-4490. The policy manual describes instructional programming and student placement models.

2. The district commits significant resources to assure English learner compliance. The English learner specialist is funded at the district level to conduct statewide compliance reviews and to provide staff development. Each site appoints an English learner coordinator to facilitate staff development and to assist English learners with assessment, placement and language assessment team meetings (LATs). Parents are offered the opportunity to participate in the LAT meeting to provide input regarding their child's education.

3. Under the “current plan for English learners”, students are programmed according to the High Point/Holt leveled test protocol. English learner students receive annual placement assessment on the High Point C test and are placed according to test scores, teacher input, parental input, and CELDT/CAHSEE test scores. Students participate in annual Language Assessment Team (LATs) meetings and individual placements are determined by the team to best meet the student needs. Placement options include Beginning, A, B, C Level and Holt with Strategic Support.
4. Students who fail to progress at a regular rate are referred to an SCT (School Consultation Team) or IEP (Individual Education Plan) to determine an appropriate “response to intervention” method necessary to bridge the language gap.

Weaknesses:

5. CELDT assessment procedures are an area of concern for the district. It is essential to obtain previous CELDT scores to assure AMAO1 is met. Otherwise, annual growth is not measurable. Education staff must find a method to motivate students to perform to their best ability during annual CELDT testing. Students assigned to a restrictive environment often refuse to participate in district assessment. AMAO2 is often not reflective of the student’s individual ability. Scores suggests that students remain at lower CELDT levels for longer periods of time and that CAHSEE/GED scores improve at a greater rate of speed.
6. The Ward Information Network needs to be enhanced to better disseminate reports for district and school level reporting. Individual EL student report cards are necessary to assist students and teachers and to provide a better understanding of English language development.
7. According to teacher responses in interview and survey questions, there were insufficient follow-up opportunities to SB395 and CLAD training. As a result, general education teachers seldom implement SDAIE strategies and reading interventions to English learners in the classroom. Teachers request that on-going staff development activities should be offered to all teachers to better understand SDAIE strategies.
8. District purchased English language development curriculum materials is not current and most teachers are not properly trained. Supplemental materials are overused in classrooms and direct instruction is seldom offered. The district must update its resources and use “CDE approved research based programs” to better service English learners.

C. Identify and describe factors contributing to failure to meet AMAO(s)

AMAO1/Students making annual progress in learning English – Student previous test score information is not readily available at receiving or intake schools. As a result, percentages are significantly lower at sites that function as an intake school. Sites with less transition and/or student movement, demonstrate scores above the state target for AMAO1. It is projected that upon completion of CALPADS, student demographic information will be more readily available and district scores will improve with the adoption of the new ELD/ELA intervention program.

AMAO2/Students attaining English proficiency on CELDT assessment – CELDT trained proctors must provide students a safe and conducive environment for effective CELDT testing. Test proctors need to emphasize the significance of improved test scores in listening, speaking, reading and writing. The improvement of the district's student information system will provide teachers logical benchmarks of English learner progress. These benchmark indicators will assist the overall process and the district goals will be attained.

AMAO 1&2/The current English Language Development program materials (High Point) are effective when utilized as designed by the publisher. Due to retirements and new teachers, a significant number of staff has not received the required High Point/Holt training. This is a negative impact on classroom success.

AMAO3/Annual Yearly Performance – will continue to be tracked using CAHSEE and CASAS test scores. The English Learner Self Survey Assessment (ELSSA) demonstrates a clear need to provide English learners with both ELA and Math interventions from Beginning to Intermediate CELDT levels. Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies are in place in the district and will assist with annual yearly progress of the individual student.

D. Conclusion/Summary

Analysis of the English Learner Self Survey Assessment (ELSSA) data demonstrates three specific areas of need to improve test scores. Improvements in these areas will assist the district with success in English language development and assist in meeting Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO's):

1. Upgrade student information system
 - data entry improvements
 - report formats
 - graphical charts
 - student progress report form
2. CELDT Training
 - improve CELDT proctor procedures
 - increase teacher understanding of CELDT results and their implications for instruction
 - assure teacher use of ELD materials, SDAIE strategies and focus on academic vocabulary
3. ELA/ELD curriculum adoption
 - material review
 - material purchase
 - staff development
 - implement monitoring

Educational activities to improve English proficiency and academic achievement	Timeline	Person Responsible	Funding Sources and Estimate	Progress Reports (to be completed periodically through June 30, 2011)
<p>2. Describe scientifically based research strategies to improve English-language Development (ELD). (AMAOs 1 and 2; English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA))</p> <p>A. The LEA provides systems that permit district and school staff to collect, report, analyze and interpret data regarding English Learners' linguistic and academic progress and achievement. (ED First and Promise Project).</p>	12/12 Completion	Farrell Vs. DJJ Education Plan Team Leader	AB900 \$135,616.00 Full Project	
<p>1. Work with technology and program staff to ensure that WIN database is able to link student data, demographics, instructional programming, services received, language proficiency, academic achievement, and reclassification criteria.</p>	8/10 12/10 4/11 quarterly	IT Staff EL Specialist	No funding required	
<p>2. Provide site administrators with user friendly reports and compliance reviews.</p>	8/10 12/10 semiannually	EL Specialist EL Principal	No funding required	
<p>3. Summarize important school demographics, teacher assignments, and student level reports, programs, and language achievement data.</p>	8/10 12/10 semiannually	EL Specialist EL Principal	No funding required	

B. Provide Staff Development on CELDT procedures and English language development concepts.	6/10-6/11 Annually	Principal EL Coordinator	No funding required	
1. Two day release for all EL coordinators and assistants to receive CELDT certification training and specific CELDT testing protocol.	6/10	EL Specialist	Title III \$5,000	
2. Two day release of teachers for review of CELDT assessment, proficiency leveling, student learning expectations, and ELD curriculum training.	8/10	EL Specialist	No funding required	
C. Purchase the Longman Keystone Language Arts/ELD program for English learners (Type 5) and for students who need remediation (Type 4)	3/10	Curriculum Specialist	Special Education Funding \$249,000.00	
1. Stock receive the learning materials and ensure that appropriate personnel have copies of the purchase order	6/10	Curriculum Specialist	No funding required	
2. Prepare staff development and implementation planning.	6/10-8/10	Curriculum Specialist	No funding required	
3. Implementation and Monitoring •Curriculum Inventory	8/10-8/11 monthly	Mentor Teachers	No funding required	
•Teacher Observations	8/10-8/11 semiannually	Assistant Principal		

7

<p>6. Describe parental participation and outreach strategies to help parents become active participants in the education of their children, including coordination efforts with other ESEA programs.</p> <p>A. Communicate regularly with parents of English learners regarding student progress toward English proficiency and their academic achievement in language arts and mathematics</p> <p>1. Invite parents to Language Assessment Team meetings to participate in their student's education program and provide interpreters or translators if needed.</p> <p>2. Provide CELDT assessment results in a language understandable to parents.</p> <p>3. Invite parents to reclassification team meetings to participate in their student's education program.</p>	<p><u>Annually</u> Date determined by district enrollment</p> <p><u>Annually</u> 10/10</p> <p><u>TBD</u> When student meets RFEP status</p>	<p>EL Coordinator</p> <p>EL Coordinator</p> <p>EL Coordinator</p>	<p>No funding required</p> <p>No funding required</p> <p>No funding required</p>	
7. If applicable, identify any changes to the Title III Immigrant Education Program.	N/A	N/A	N/A	